Remarks

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-11 and 15-17 are pending. Claims 12 and 13 are canceled in this Response.

All pending claims stand rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Samsung (EP0996055) in view of Xerox (EP0917044).

Notifying A Printer Administrator (Claims 1, 5, 7 and 9)

Claim 1 recites that the printer administrator is notified by the first printer as to any print job redirections made by the first printer. Claims 5, 7 and 9 recite a similar limitation. The Office asserts, incorrectly, that Xerox teaches this element at paragraphs 0017-0021.

The only references to any kind of a communication from a printer in Xerox paragraphs 0017-0021 are set forth below verbatim.

> "Depending on the type of output device 500 and/or the settings of its particular features, each output device 500 returns responses to the server 200 indicating, for example, its current state." Xerox paragraph 0018.

> * * *

> "The supervisor 420 also ... handles any responses made by the output devices 500." Xerox paragraph 0021.

These passages in Xerox do not teach or even suggest the claimed notification. Indeed, they do not teach or suggest any kind of notification. To the extent these passages in Xerox might be deemed relevant at all to this particular claim element, Xerox stands for the unremarkable proposition that bi-directional communication between a server and a printer was known in the art. Of course, the fact that bi-directional communication between a server and a printer was known does not make obvious any and all communications from a printer to a server, specifically not the notification of print job redirection recited in Claims 1, 5, 7 and 9. If the Office disagrees, it is respectfully requested to specifically point out and explain the language in Xerox that might somehow reasonably be deemed to teach that the "responses" mentioned are something other than the printer simply returning

Response To Office Action
Serial No. 09/986,608
Attorney Docket No. 10014400-1   -5-

PAGE 7/9 * RCVD AT 12/11/2006 12:09:06 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-5/20 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:208 433 9295 * DURATION (mm-ss):01-32

its status when queried by the server. Absent such a showing, the rejection of Claims 1, 5, 7 and 9 should be withdrawn.

In any event, the combination of Samsung and Xerox is not properly motivated for Claims 1, 5, 7 and 9. The Office asserts the combination is motivated "for the printer administrator (420) to be notified of the output device's current state as taught by Xerox in Par. 0018." This assertion is not correct. In Claim 1, the printer administrator is notified by a printer as to any print job redirections made by that printer. The status of the printer is irrelevant to this notification. That is to say, the status response in Xerox does not motivate or suggest affirmatively notifying the administrator that a print job has been redirect. In Xerox, the printer administrator already knows where each print job is directed because it is the director. Moreover, print jobs are not *redirected* in Xerox. There is just nothing in Xerox or in Samsung that even remotely suggests the two might somehow be combined to arrive at the inventions recited in Claims 1, 5, 7 and 9.

Again, if the Office disagrees it is respectfully requested to *explain* how a skilled artisan would be motivated by the printer status responses in Xerox to somehow apply Xerox's server based print job direction system to the printer redirecting scheme of Samsung to arrive at the invention of Claims 1, 5, 7 and 9.

Ready State Printer Redirecting The Print Job

Claim 6 recites that the first and second printers are in a ready state and that the first printer redirects the print job to the second printer even though the first printer is in a ready state when the information contained in the print job is such that the capabilities of the first printer will not allow it to properly perform the print job. Claim 17 recites similar limitations.

Samsung teaches a printer redirecting a print job to another printer only if there is a print error at the first printer — that is to say, when the printer is in a not-ready state. Xerox teaches a server sending a print job to one of multiple printers based on "max-concurrent-jobs-processing", "number-of-jobs-on-device" and "number-of-cascaded-jobs", and an attribute value "saturated" for the attribute "printer-state." Xerox Abstract. There is no redirecting of a print job in Xerox from a printer that does not have the capabilities to perform the print job to a printer that does have the capabilities to perform the print job. Indeed, one of the primary

Response To Office Action
Serial No. 09/986,608
Attorney Docket No. 10014400-1   -6-

objectives of the printer management server in Xerox is to never send a print job to a printer that does not have the capabilities to perform the print job. Hence, Xerox actually teaches away from this limitation in Claims 6 and 17 and the combination of Samsung and Xerox, even if properly motivated, does not teach a ready state printer redirecting a print job to another printer.

In any event, the combination of Samsung and Xerox is not properly motivated for Claims 6 and 17. First, as noted above, Xerox teaches away from sending the print job to a printer which does not have the capabilities to perform the print job. Second, the combination of Samsung and Xerox does not "balance the load on each of the output devices as taught by Xerox in par. 38." The Office's assertion to the contrary is not correct. Balancing the load in Xerox refers to a server distributing print jobs to the printer best able to handle the job at any particular time. This balancing act is defeated by sending a print job to a printer the server knows cannot perform the print job and then having that "incapable" printer send the print job on to another "capable" printer. Again, if the Office disagrees, it is respectfully respected to *explain* how a skilled artisan would be motivated to somehow apply Xerox's server based printer balancing act to the not-ready printer redirecting scheme of Samsung to arrive at the invention of Claims 6 and 17.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding office action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven R. Ormiston/

Steven R. Ormiston
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 35,974
208.433.1991 x204

Response To Office Action
Serial No. 09/986,608
Attorney Docket No. 10014400-1   -7-